

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,730	02/08/2001	Hong-Sam Kim	P56295	6891
7590 12/09/2004		EXAMINER		
Robert E. Bushnell ATTORNEY-AT-LAW Suite 300 1522 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-1202			LIPMAN, JACOB	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
			DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



		<del></del>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/778,730	KIM ET AL.	(A)			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jacob Lipman	2134				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addre	ess			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may by within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) Note, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this comr ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 C	October 2004.					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	, <del>_</del>					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 7-22 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)⊠ Claim(s) 10-12 and 19 is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,13-18 and 20-22 is/are reje 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in prity documents have be au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National St	tage			
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	Paper	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/778,730 Page 2

Art Unit: 2134

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 13-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord, 5,198,806, as outlined in the prior office action.
- 3. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Na, US Patent number 6,366,957.

With regard to Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, Na discloses a method of operating a computer by remote controller (column 3 lines 1-5) including transmitting a first security code stored in the remote controller to the computer (column 3 lines 5-10), checking to see if the first security code matches a second security code stored in the computer (column 3 lines 10-13) and converting from a standby mode, which is also acting as a screen saver, to a normal mode when the security codes match (column 3 lines 13-18).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 9 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Na.

With regard to claims 3 and 9, Na discloses the method of claim 1, as outlined above, but does not mention the network being wireless. The examiner takes official notice that wireless networks are common. It would have been obvious to use a wireless network in Na's remote wake-up method for easy of setup.

With regard to claim 20, the wireless control is determined to be wireless as outlined above, and the wake-up signal is inherently sent when a button is pressed.

With regard to claims 21 and 22, Na does not mention the network device could be handheld. The examiner takes official notice that handheld computers are well known, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the network device handheld to increase portability. The examiner also points to In Re Lindberg, 194 F.2d 732, 735, 93 USPQ 23, 26 (CCPA 1952), which states that making something portable is a modification that's is within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori, US Patent number 4,754,268, in view of Rathbone.

With regard to claim 16, Rathbone discloses a screen saver (page 167 paragraph 7), which will be revived if a signal from a mouse is received, but does not disclose the mouse is wireless, and only works if sent data matches corresponding data

Art Unit: 2134

in the computer. Mori discloses a wireless mouse (column 1 lines 48-54) that sends a frequency that only operates computers with matching frequency (column 1 line 58-column 2 line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Mori's wireless mouse in Rathbone's description of Microsoft Windows 95, for Mori's stated motivation to make the mouse more convenient to use (column 1 lines 20-47).

With regard to claim 17, Mori discloses that a mouse controls a computer (column 2 line 66-column 3 line 4).

With regard to claim 18, Rathbone discloses that once out of screen saver, the user is prompted for a password (page 168 paragraph 3).

### Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10-12 and 19 are allowed.

#### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/6/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to applicant submitting that "remote controllers are wireless and handheld", the examiner points to new claim 22. Claim 22 states ""the remote controller being a wireless hand held remote controller", which inherently states that there are remote controllers that are not handheld and wireless. Claim 3 and 21 take each limitation individually, showing a remote controller can be neither handheld nor wireless. Applicant shows an example of a handheld wireless remote controller, and the examiner aggress that it is well known that remote controllers are often handheld and wireless,

Art Unit: 2134

but this does not show that they must be, and are inherently so. Applicant also supplies a definition of a "remote control", and while this is not the term in the claims, the examiner has submitted another dictionary definition from <a href="The American Heritage">The American Heritage</a>
<a href="College Dictionary">College Dictionary</a>. The dictionary defines a remote control as, "the control of an activity, process or machine from a distance, as by radioed instruction or coded signals. 2. A device used to control an apparatus or machine from a distance". This definition does not specify that a remote controller is inherently hand held or wireless, as applicant discloses in claims 3, 21, and 22.

With regard to applicant's argument that in claims 16-18 "the remote control sends a password", the examiner found no mention of a password in these claims.

With regard to applicant's challenge of the examiner's official notice that wireless networks are common, the examiner pointed in the advisory action to Microsoft's Computer Dictionary, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Microsoft defines a wireless LAN as a network that does not require a physical connection between nodes and a hub (page 510).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Lipman whose telephone number is 571-272-3738. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 - 4:00 (M-Th).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 571-272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/778,730

Art Unit: 2134

2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JL

GREGORY MORSE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 6

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100